

Tuesday, December 11th 1990

Today's Topics:

Re: Netmail
Re: Al seckel
Phoenix Skeptics
Phoenix Skeptics cont.
Re: NAVY INTELLIGENCE CRYPT
Phenom 12-7-90
Prof. Jean-Pierre Petit
Phoenix Skeptics cont.
Help
Don Ecker
Interview with Jean-Pierre Petit
Interview with Jean-Pierre Petit Part 2
Interview with Jean-Pierre Petit Part 3

From: Jim.Speiser@f37.n114.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Speiser)
Subject: Re: Netmail
Date: 9 Dec 90 17:02:00 GMT

>
> Some sort of "...here!there!everywhere!whodat" business, I
> assume?
>
> Best Regards,
> Rick_Moen@f207.n914.z8.rbbs-net.org
> ...llnl!wyrml207!Rick.Moen

Something like that.

J_Speiser@f37.n114.z1.FIDONet.org
jjs!yoohoo!doodah!ree.te.dee!cha.cha.cha...

--

Jim Speiser - via FidoNet node 1:310/8
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Jim.Speiser@f37.n114.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Jim.Speiser@f37.n114.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Speiser)
Subject: Re: Al seckel
Date: 9 Dec 90 17:11:00 GMT

I missed that article in Smear as I tend to skip over anything written by Beckjord.

My sincere apologies to Michael Dennett, I DID mean John Merrell. Dennett happens to be an excellent spokesman for the skeptical movement.

Randi had some other troubles which you may not have heard about. He allegedly accused Eldon Byrd of being a convicted child molester, when no such conviction had taken place. [ADDENDUM: I see you have addressed this in a subsequent post.]

And I knew Gauquelin was not a skeptic, I was referring to the "Gauquelin incident," which was, I think, a bit more significant than you imply. It is my understanding that the Mars Effect has never been successfully debunked (much to MY chagrin as much as anyone else's). Am I wrong in that understanding?

Jim

--

Jim Speiser - via FidoNet node 1:310/8

UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name

INTERNET: Jim.Speiser@f37.n114.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Jim.Speiser@f37.n114.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Speiser)

Subject: Phoenix Skeptics

Date: 9 Dec 90 21:49:00 GMT

I just had the interesting experience of speaking on UFOs to the Phoenix Skeptics, of which I am a member. I joined out of curiosity a couple of years ago, but have learned that local groups can do a lot of good work in ferreting out charlatanism, especially the medical kind. Its also good to have local groups dissenting the spread of Creation Science in schoolrooms, and I support their efforts 100% in this and other matters.

The members know I disagree with them on the UFO subject, I know they know it, and they accept me and I still function within the group. Overall its a very good bunch of people, and we have a good time.

Anyway, Mike Stackpole, the director, asked me to speak on the latest developments in Ufology, especially the Gulf Breeze affair. I tried desperately to boil down 3 years worth of controversy into half an hour, and failed miserably to convey the immense complexity of the case. Besides, I got the feeling I was preaching to the converted. "<Yawn> So Ufology is inept; what else is new?" One of the members challengingly asked me if I had any examples of cases that were relatively uncontroversial and unambiguous. I replied, "Yes", and proceeded to trot out the Belgium case. I read to them

from the military press release (BELGPR.TXT) and showed them the video from Hard Copy - my VCR-TV connections were bad, so it didn't show up too well, but I managed to get it working well enough to also show them the Kanazawa tape.

I got the Kanazawa tape via Federal Express from Dr. Richard Haines, may his name be exalted forever, just in time for the meeting. As you might have read here about a year ago, I consider this tape to be the most impressive UFO video I've ever seen. There is no question of misidentification. There is no ancillary controversy - no blue beams, no anonymous letters to the local paper, no conversations in Spanish, no alien visits, etc. There is, I am assured, no chance of computer animation antics - we've come far in that field, but not quite this far. There is nothing except a Japanese man trying desperately to focus in on what for all appearances is a flying saucer, complete with foreground references, anomalous motions, reflections in all the right places, just the right amount of camera jiggle, etc. Yes, being strictly skeptical, you can hypothesize various ways in which it might be done, but subjectively, having viewed many such videos and photos, I'll stake my reputation that this is no hoax. Whatever true UFOs are, this is one of them. (It should be stressed that this is my own view, not that of Dr. Haines, who is still analyzing the video.)

<continued>

--

Jim Speiser - via FidoNet node 1:310/8
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Jim.Speiser@f37.n114.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Jim.Speiser@f37.n114.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Speiser)
Subject: Phoenix Skeptics cont.
Date: 9 Dec 90 22:28:00 GMT

Anyway, I got some good comments on the tape from some of the gathered members - one said he'd like to see it under clearer conditions, and that I may have something interesting here. The negative comments, however, were what I was looking for. You see, I enjoy presenting to skeptics for two reasons: first, I like to have holes punched in my arguments (ok, I'm a glutton for punishment) - kind of a reality check. After all, if I'm all wet, I wanna come in out of the rain! Second, if I get no arguments, or the same tired old ones, I know we're REALLY on to something.

Suffice it to say that the tape survived without receiving a single hole. One gent said it looked like a Stealth fighter, but I'm sure if the picture were clearer he would recant. Another member raised the possibility of computer-generated graphics. This is a tough one to counter, but I have recently viewed some tapes of state-of-the-art virtual reality modeling, and I get the definite impression that we are not quite advanced enough to imitate the subtle nuances of image-blurring from motion, nor the other highly

subjective properties seen in this tape. Computer animation creates a too-perfect, too-fluid world, even when it tries to imitate imperfection and stiltedness. You can still tell the difference. Its possible, I suppose, that someone in Japan has perfected the technique, but this tape was made a year and a half ago, and there are millions to be made in the computer-animation field. I believe we would have heard something by now.

Many of the skeptics seemed unswayed by this argument - it seems to have become an indelible fact(oid) that "computers can imitate real life so much that we can never trust a photo or video again." In the case of photographs, its almost certainly true, but videos are another thing altogether. However, I agree that the video should be heavily analyzed for this possibility.

The rest of the meeting was filled with a very revealing discussion that touched on many aspects of skeptical philosophy. One gentleman claimed that he was not going to believe until he had hard physical evidence of alien contact. My response was, "believe what?" There seems to be this notion that anyone claiming UFOs exist is arguing for the ET Hypothesis. He asked me what *I* thought was behind it all, and I told him that I *personally* think it might just be aliens, but that I wasn't there to argue the point. My point was that he, as a skeptic, could not explain the video, leaving a question mark where an answer should be, and that science is in the business of answering questions. The fact that I believe in the *possibility* of aliens was immaterial.

The discussion seemed to break down at this point over the question of the proper role of skepticism, and how much skepticism is too much. One member chastised the other, (making it clear that he did not support me) saying, "I acknowledge that I am dogmatically opposed to your point of view. But let's acknowledge that its dogmatism, not skepticism."

The bottom line seems to be that, while we are making inroads in convincing some skeptics that bona fide unexplainables - indeed, downright bafflers - exist, their basic philosophy is that there is so profoundly little chance that they could turn out to be anything truly earth-shattering, due to the pre-eminence of scientific knowledge of the universe, that UFOs are simply not worth bothering with. They will not begrudge us our right to look into them, but short of the proverbial White House landing, we're on our own in our pursuit of the truth behind their nature. As with any dogmatic belief, its hard to argue with.

Still, having reassured myself that we're not chasing faeries and that we are in pursuit of a legitimate mystery that so far has no answers, I came away satisfied with the results of the meeting. I think I did manage to convince some people that we're a far cry from channelers and crystal-rattlers, and that we do have a big "?" here. Its just an argument over what to do about it.

Jim

--

Jim Speiser - via FidoNet node 1:310/8
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Jim.Speiser@f37.n114.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Pete.Porro@f414.n154.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Pete Porro)
Subject: Re: NAVY INTELLIGENCE CRYPT
Date: 9 Dec 90 09:46:11 GMT

I'll be trying to freq it tomorrow if I get a chance. Thanks for the addition.

--

Pete Porro - via FidoNet node 1:310/8
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Pete.Porro@f414.n154.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Frank.Wegori@p0.f80.n120.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Frank Wegori)
Subject: Phenom 12-7-90
Date: 8 Dec 90 04:07:21 GMT

Greetings fellow observers! What was it that the early morning crowd saw this morning at 0552 hrs near Plymouth, Michigan? One eyewitness reported to a local allnews radio station, that he saw a bluish-green oval shaped object, emitting sparks(?) and in a crash-like trajectory. He said he thought at first that it might have been a helicopter crashing, but said the shape (or something) changed his mind. Sounded pretty shook up. Later I saw a ten second sound bite on CH7 which did not elaborate. No news re: any debris or ground indentations. Anyone hear anything?

--

Frank Wegori - via FidoNet node 1:310/8
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Frank.Wegori@p0.f80.n120.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Don.Ecker@f22.n30163.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Don Ecker)
Subject: Prof. Jean-Pierre Petit
Date: 10 Dec 90 06:11:00 GMT

- * Forwarded from "INFO.PARANET"
- * Originally from Don Ecker
- * Originally dated 12-09-90 22:08

Attention all ParaNet Members;

I have just uploaded PETIT.UFO to Alpha. I scanned the file into the system, and I will be interested in comments. This could prove to be a very significant addition to the data base. Petit is no lightweight scientific type, the man carries a very heavy reputation in Europe.

Don

--

Don Ecker - via FidoNet node 1:310/8
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Don.Ecker@f22.n30163.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Don.Ecker@f22.n30163.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Don Ecker)
Subject: Phoenix Skeptics cont.
Date: 10 Dec 90 06:15:00 GMT

Jim;

Very very interesting in reference to the Skeptics meeting. Can not wait to see this video.

Just as an aside, just what do these folks think all this is? I do not recall anyone being completely dogmatic that these things are ET, but how can they refute that these objects are still flying about, apparently immune to current state of the art Military aircraft? Belgium for example? And-----I would be very interested in the Skeptics rebutal to Prof. Jean-Pierre Petit.

Don

--

Don Ecker - via FidoNet node 1:310/8
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Don.Ecker@f22.n30163.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: vm1.yorku.ca!YSCS1296@scicom.AlphaCDC.COM
Subject: Help
Date: 11 Dec 90 04:51:48 GMT

From: User <YSCS1296@vm1.yorku.ca>

Was wondering how I as a bitnet user could gain access to the myriad of neat files you have on the MJ-12 scenario and related material such as JFK's assassination and other such issues. Also would appreciate any pointers to other media such as movies (e.g., I recently took out the old movie HANGAR 18 which was an attempt at an expose of the Roswell incident and WPAFB Hangar 18; Communion, the movie; etc...) and any other related stuff (e.g., Ancient Astronauts - Chariot of the gods).... Thanks. Or is there a Paranet node in Toronto or nearby?

From: mcorbin@paranet.FIDONET.ORG (Michael Corbin)
Subject: Don Ecker
Date: 10 Dec 90 18:47:00 GMT

My thanks to Don Ecker who has demonstrated his dedication to ParaNet by uploading the first text file scanned with a Scanman Optical Scanner and using OCR software. This equipment is not inexpensive and I am very proud of the work that Don has done for the good of the network. Don will be scanning a lot of text files in the future for ParaNet.

Again, thanks Don!!

Mike

--
Michael Corbin - via FidoNet node 1:310/8
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: mcorbin@paranet.FIDONET.ORG

From: mcorbin@paranet.FIDONET.ORG (Michael Corbin)
Subject: Interview with Jean-Pierre Petit
Date: 10 Dec 90 18:49:00 GMT

The following messages may not be reposted outside of the ParaNet Information Service Network without citing the proper organization or persons: The French Match Magazine, Don Ecker and ParaNet Information Service.

THE STATEMENTS OF PROFESSOR PETIT, WHO JUST RETURNED FROM BELGIUM, WHERE HE INVESTIGATED THE RECENT CELESTIAL APPARITIONS.

"WHY I THINK THEY COME FROM SPACE."

Among the scientists who rushed to Belgium to study the grand show of flying saucers which was seen in recent months, Professor Jean-Pierre Petit was one of the first to arrive. He was among the handful of Investigators who had direct contact with the pilots who encountered the UFO on their radar screens. To him, this is proof that the UFOs are not an optical illusion. But then the question arises, where do they come from? Professor Petit, along with many other scientists, believes that they are of extraterrestrial origin. This physicist, a specialist in plasmas and cosmology, and a Director of the National Science Research Center of France, has just published his views in a very provocative book entitled Investigating UFOs, published by Albin Michel. In the book he explains the reasons we cannot exclude the possibility that the UFOs are piloted by beings originating elsewhere in the universe.

NOW WE KNOW WHY THE PHOTOGRAPHS TAKEN OF UFOS BY AMATEURS ARE ALWAYS BAD.

Q: Professor Petit, given the fact that the majority of scientists refuse to study the UFO phenomenon, doesn't the publication of your book automatically relegate you to the domain of "fringe" science?

A: Absolutely not. I have been working at the Marseille Observatory for 15 years and I can assure you that nobody in this research facility, which is part of the French National Center for Science, considers me to be a fringe scientist. I publish my scientific work in the most prestigious scientific journals of theoretical physics, such as Modern Physics Letters. My most recent publication, which treated the subject of quasars, those objects located at the farthest reaches of the universe and that we think may be the kernels of forming galaxies, was co-authored by the astronomer Maurice Viton, who is on the staff of the Marseille Laboratory.

Q: Do you consider yourself a rationalist?

A: 100%. The reader will not find in my book any reference to mysticism or the phenomena that we call paranormal.

Q: But, in the libraries they put your book in with those dealing with mysticism.

A: That is based on the fact that until now the UFO phenomenon has never been treated in a scientific manner. The literature that deals with this subject has always been mediocre. Let's hope that after a while my book will find its true place, in the Science department.

Q: Does the UFO constitute a scientific problem?

A: Yes. The work of physicists Meesen and Brenig, as well as mine, shows clearly that the UFO phenomenon is amenable to a scientific and rigorous approach.

Q: How can science explain the sightings? Don't we need new scientific concepts?

A: There exist aspects of the phenomenon which can be approached with success by using quite conventional tools of science. Let me give you a precise example. The people who photographed the UFO were often very upset when they saw that the film they took did not correspond by a long shot with what they had seen with their eyes. We do not have any photograph of the UFO taken from very near, say less than 100 meters, simply because at such close range the object does not show up on the negative. During this recent wave of sightings in Belgium, many pictures were taken, but they show nothing. The physicist Auguste Meesen, Professor at the University of Louvain, has proposed an explanation for this failure. In certain conditions, infrared rays coming from an object have the ability to totally inhibit the chemical reaction that permits fixing an image on a negative.

Q: Is this a theory?

A: Not at all. It is a fact demonstrated by experiment that has been known for a long time, but nobody up to now has thought of it in connection with UFO photos.

Q: So the UFOs will protect themselves from being photographed by emitting infrared rays?

A: That is possible, but this emission is perhaps simply tied to the normal operation of the machines.

Q: Would there be any way, then, to trick this protection in order to obtain pictures despite the infrared radiation?

Continued in next message...

--

Michael Corbin - via FidoNet node 1:310/8
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: mcorbin@paranet.FIDONET.ORG

From: mcorbin@paranet.FIDONET.ORG (Michael Corbin)
Subject: Interview with Jean-Pierre Petit Part 2
Date: 10 Dec 90 20:43:00 GMT

>Petit Interview - Part 2 Continued

A: Of course. By using film sensitive to the infrared portion of the spectrum.

Q: If I understand you correctly, given that hundreds of Belgians observed the UFOs from close range (some of the UFOs were quite immobile above the rooftops of houses), if this discovery had been made six months ago, we could have the first precise pictures of this mysterious flying object?

A: Exactly.

Q: You haven't hesitated to use the term "machines." In your opinion, what are UFOs?

A: Today, we can answer quite categorically that it is a material object. At the beginning of the year a report was sent to SOBEPS by the Chief of Staff of the Belgian Air Force, on the authority of the Minister of Defense. Then, on 22 June, 1990 this report was supplemented by the documents gathered by you for Paris Match, which consisted of the recordings of five radars, three in the ground and two on board the F-16 fighters which were sent to chase the UFO. During this chase, which lasted 75 minutes, the two F-16s managed three interceptions during which all of the parameters of flight of the object were determined. This study was done with very great care by the Belgian specialists before they divulged the information, in order to exclude the possibility that there was a malfunction of the radars or the computers.

Q: Are they flying machines?

A: Given the speed of those machines, more than 1,800 kilometers per hour, they could not have been weather balloons. Given the trajectory, it could not have been a meteorite or any satellite in the reentry phase of space flight. Given the meteorological conditions, it could not have been either natural phenomena or false radar echoes. Given the accelerations that were measured -- 40 Gs -- this could not have been an airplane. Let's recall that one of the machines accelerated in one second from 280 KPH to 1,830 KPH.

Q: But anti-missile missiles, aren't they capable of accelerations of 100 Gs?

A: Yes, but in fact there is at this moment no man made machine that is capable of performing at mach 1.5 close to the ground because of heating due to the high air density.

And, in this case, there was no sonic boom.

Q: It was witnesses on the ground who reported the absence of a sonic boom. Can we trust them?

A: The question of witnesses is superfluous. If the breaching of the sound barrier at very low altitude had been done with aircraft using our technology, it would have caused tens of thousands of windows to be broken in the suburbs south of Brussels, above which the UFO was flying.

Q: Were these only "paper" studies?

Q: If I follow your argument, this machine did not come from the Earth?

A: An earthly origin would seem to me totally excluded.

Q: But can't we imagine some ultrasecret prototype?

A: The aeronautical engineer and physicist that I am answers you, categorically, no. We are actually incapable of building a machine with such performance, and don't forget that such phenomena have been observed for the last 35 years.

Q: Was this the first time a UFO was observed on radar?

A: Certainly not, but this is the first interception officially acknowledged.

Q: But the breaking of the sound barrier without an accompanying boom must result from physics that we don't understand?

A: As surprising as it must appear, no. There is a theory that I have elaborated as early as 1975. Between 1965 and 1975, when I was experimenting in my fluid dynamics laboratory, I was working on an electrical generator which is now one of the principal gadgets in the Star Wars technology. We made shock waves by making electromagnetic waves react in a gas. I said to myself: If we can create shock waves with electromagnetic fields, one should be able with the same fields to annihilate shock waves forming around an object. When an object moves faster than sound, the air molecules have a tendency to pile up in front of the object, without being able to move off to the side and out of the way. This forms a shock wave, which is noticed by an observer on the ground as a "boom." To prevent this shock wave from forming it is only required that we help the air molecules to escape by sucking in the air at the same time that it is piling up. The machine advances through the air literally making a vacuum in front of it. It is a fundamental and exceedingly simple idea. It happens that we

can execute this aspiration of gas at a distance with the help of well known electromagnetic forces called "the force of Laplace. The means of acting on a gas with electromagnetic fields is known as magnetohydrodynamics, or Mhd. On the theoretical plane, these concepts date from the 1950s. We were left to determine the optimum shape of objects for this process. I was extremely surprised to find that this flying saucer had little in common with the shape of an airplane or missile, but that it had the shape of spheres, cylinders and saucers. And I have invented an object that I have called an Mhd Aerodyne, which devilishly resembles a flying saucer!

Continued next message..

--

Michael Corbin - via FidoNet node 1:310/8
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: mcorbin@paranet.FIDONET.ORG

From: mcorbin@paranet.FIDONET.ORG (Michael Corbin)
Subject: Interview with Jean-Pierre Petit Part 3
Date: 10 Dec 90 20:45:00 GMT

>>Petit Interview - Part 3 Continued<<

Q: Were these only "paper" studies?

A: Not at all. There have been computer simulations as well as publications in international technical journals, and two doctoral thesis demonstrating the feasibility of supersonic flight without a "boom" by using Mhd.

Q: Are these theories contested by other scientists?

A: Absolutely not. And in this scientific environment as soon as we notice an error or a weakness in a work we are not afraid to call it out, loud and strong in the scientific journals or in the popularized science magazines such as Science et vie, Pour la science, La Recherche, Science et avenir, etc. For the last 25 years that I have been doing research, and the 15 years that I have concentrated on this thorny problem, none of these magazines has ever published a commentary disparaging me. Believe me, the critics think twice before attacking a work of research. When I first became interested in UFOs in 1976 a member of the Academy of Science somehow imprudently declared during a public conference that a machine could not fly through the

air with the help of electromagnetic forces. When it was time for my reply, he was waiting for a response based on theory, and was extremely surprised when we brought in a very simple and clear experiment whose result contradicted his proposition. When one tosses criticisms too lightly, one risks being ridiculed, and that is not pleasant for anybody.

Q: This UFO which was chased by the F-16s in Belgium, could it not be a very simple ultra secret American or Russian machine functioning with electricity?

A: To manufacture such a machine would require that the engine develop an amount of power equivalent to that of a large nuclear power generating plant. And if there is anything not amenable to miniaturization, it is a nuclear power plant. Conclusion: the machines seen in Belgium are not of terrestrial origin.

Q: Given the fantastic acceleration detected by the Belgian F-16, no human could have been aboard, and the UFOs must have been simple robots rather than a vehicle carrying a living being.

A: Even though the human body in a state of total immersion can bear great acceleration, the 40 Gs gives us a problem. But there is more to it. Numerous eyewitness reports tell of right angle turns taken at full speed. In this particular case the acceleration becomes...infinite, and the machine itself could not support the turn without vanishing. I have tried to approach this question in a very speculative manner in my book. In this phase of strong acceleration, physical phenomena more sophisticated than Mhd could take such a turn.

Q: How could you explain the absence of debate concerning UFOs in the scientific community?

A: Until now, when a scientist wanted to have some information on the subject, he could only find very superficial or trivial books. Also, the contents of the newsletters published by some French UFO research groups is not of a nature to encourage further interest by scientists. Nor could a scientist be favorably impressed by the publications of GEPAN (Groupe d'Etude des Phenomenes Aerospatiaux Non-identifies, a UFO study group created within the French National Center for Space Studies). What do you want, when a scientist opens a book where the UFOs are compared to fairies and elves, and to the ministrations of the Virgin Mary? He will slam the book shut at once. But it is not simply because a subject is polluted by persons with debatable competence that it should be brushed aside. With the reports of the Belgian military in hand we now have the objective unarguable data that was formerly

absent in the files, and this should interest scientists.

Q: The military has a reputation for being very silent in general, and is particularly silent when the topic of UFOs comes up, and has gone to the point of actually spreading disinformation, as has been shown recently by investigator Jean Sider in his work Ultra Top Secret--The UFOs Which Bring Fear (Axis Mundi Editions). How do you explain this sudden about-face in the political scene, to a policy of openness and honesty on the part of the Belgian Defense Minister?

A: Among the reasons for the reticence of military men to divulge the information in their possession is the worry that publication will cause hysteria. Another reason may be that Belgium is the only country in the world where, for 18 years, the subject of UFOs has been closely followed by real scientists. So an exceptional climate of confidence has been developed.

Q: And in France?

--

Michael Corbin - via FidoNet node 1:310/8

UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name

INTERNET: mcorbin@paranet.FIDONET.ORG

*****To have your comments in the next issue, send electronic mail to*****
'infopara' at the following address:

UUCP	{ncar,isis,boulder}!scicom!infopara
DOMAIN	infopara@scicom.alphacdc.com
ADMIN Address	infopara-request@scicom.alphacdc.com
	{ncar,isis,boulder}!scicom!infopara-request

*****The**End**of**Info-ParaNet**Newsletter*****